



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE.	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/694.639	10/27/2003	Michael Cima	TPI-T2200XC2	5317
22913 7590 07/13/2007 WORKMAN NYDEGGER			EXAMINER	
(F/K/A WORKMAN NYDEGGER & SEELEY) 60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE			BEISNER, WILLIAM H	
	GATE TOWER		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SALT LAKE O	CITY, UT 84111		1744	
		•	· .	
•		·	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
•		•	07/13/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

•						
·	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/694,639	CIMA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
·	William H. Beisner	1744				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period way reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. sely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 M	arch 2007 and 30 April 2007.					
,	·					
·	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ⊠ Claim(s) 16-18 is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-15 and 19-21 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.	·				
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the l drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Sec ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)		·				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Di 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:					

Art Unit: 1744

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-4, 7, 8, 15 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rudiger et al.(US 4,887,611).

With respect to claims 1 and 19, the reference of Rudiger et al. discloses an assay plate (See Figures 2 and 4) adapted for use with and attachment to a curved animal body part, comprising:

a flexible substrate (12) having a flexible substrate surface; and at least one raised pad (16) extending from said flexible substrate surface and having a substantially planar sample receiving surface configured for holding a sample (17) thereon for in-situ experimentation, the flexible substrate (12) being sufficiently flexible so as to permit the flexible substrate to conform to a curvature of a curved animal body part.

With respect to claim 2, the sample receiving surface is circular and the raised pad is made from metal (See column 4, lines 26-43).

With respect to claims 3 and 4, the angle between the side wall of the pad and sample surface is considered to meet the instant claims since the pad (16) is a disk.

With respect to claim 7, the reference discloses multiple pads (16) (See Figures 2 and 4).

Art Unit: 1744

With respect to claim 8, use of the disclosed device includes depositing sample (17) on the pad and attaching the substrate to an animal.

With respect to claim 15, attaching the substrate to an animal results with the sample being overlayed with a membrane or tissue.

With respect to claim 20, the reference discloses the use of an array of samples (17) supported by the sample receiving surface.

With respect to claim 21, the device of Rudiger et al. is considered a transfermal delivery device since it is contacted with the skin of an animal.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various

Art Unit: 1744

claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 5, 6, and 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rudiger et al.(US 4,887,611).

The reference of Rudiger et al. has been discussed above.

With respect to claims 5 and 6, while the reference of Rudiger et al. discloses the use of a plurality of samples, the reference does not provide the number and/or dimensions recited in claims 5 and 6.

However, in the absence of a showing of criticality and/or unexpected results, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine the optimum dimensions and/or number of sample pads to employ based merely on the intended use of the device and/or sample to be contacted with the animal.

With respect to the sample preparation of claims 9-12, in the absence of a showing of criticality and/or unexpected results, it would have been with the purview of one having ordinary skill in the art to determine the optimum manner in which to provide the sample to the sample surface while maintaining the efficiency of the test device.

With respect to the method of manufacture of claims 13 and 14, in the absence of a showing of criticality and/or unexpected results, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

Page 5

Application/Control Number: 10/694,639

Art Unit: 1744

skill in the art to determine the optimum manner in which to construct the device based merely on considerations such as the material to be employed. Different materials require different manufacturing techniques.

Terminal Disclaimer

7. The terminal disclaimer filed on 3/30/07 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of US Patent No. 6,908,760 and US Application No. 10/556,996 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 16-18 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments, see pages 8-12 of the response filed 3/30/07 and page 6 of the response filed 4/30/07, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-15 and 19-21 under 35 USC 102 and 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Rudiger et al.(US 4,887,611) in response to the amendments to the claims.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 1744

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William H. Beisner whose telephone number is 571-272-1269. The examiner can normally be reached on Tues. to Fri. and alt. Mon. from 6:15am to 3:45pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gladys J. Corcoran can be reached on 571-272-1214. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1744

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/William H. Beisner/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 1744

WHB